

Claim 1 recites a method for measuring a parameter of a circuit under test, the method comprising “disconnecting [a] test circuit from respective voltage terminals providing . . . first and second voltage levels; and measuring said parameter of said circuit under test with said test circuit.” [Emphasis added.] Yasui does not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 1.

While the Office Action points to a portion of Yasui which states that the indication lamp 18 is lit to inform the operator of a decrease of the capacitance value of condenser 6 prior to the start of the vehicle (Yasui at column 4, lines 50-55), there is *no* support for the statement in the Office Action that the switch 1a is *open* when the indication lamp is lit. That is, although the vehicle may not yet be started when the lamp is lit, as described below, the switch 1a must be closed and the lamp 18 must be connected to the power source 1.

For example, Yasui discloses that “in case the capacitance value of condenser 6 decreases [a condition which would illuminate the lamp 18] . . . the charged voltage of condenser 6 becomes higher than the reference voltage.” Yasui at column 4, lines 41-44. In order for the charged voltage of the condenser 6 to become higher, it must be connected to the power source 1. This must be true since when the ignition switch 1a is opened . . . the charged voltage condenser 6 is discharged through the electric control circuit.” Yasui at column 4, lines 37-40.

Yasui further states that the indication lamp 18 is supplied with electric energy from the battery 1 upon conduction of SCR 17 to inform the operator of decrease of the capacitance value of condenser 6. Yasui at column 3, lines 57-61. Therefore, the assumption in the Office Action that since the vehicle has not yet started, the switch 1a must be open, is incorrect. At least for these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Yasui.

Claim 51 recites a semiconductor die comprising a first storage capacitor coupled to a power source and also coupled to a comparator, said first storage capacitor “providing power to said comparator when said comparator is disconnected from said

power source.” Without citing to any specific portion of Yasui, the Office Action states that Yasui discloses these limitations; however, as discussed below, Yasui does not disclose these limitations of claim 51.

Rather, Yasui discloses that if one of the conductors 1b, 1c is disconnected, the storage condenser 6 is discharged through the diode 7 to energize the primer 2. That is, nowhere does Yasui teach or suggest that the condenser provide power to the comparator when the comparator is disconnected from the power source. The primer 2 is a different component of the electric control circuit than the comparator 12 and serves an entirely different purpose. At least for these reasons, claim 51 is allowable over Yasui.

Claims 3-5, 12-14 and 17-19 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons mentioned above and also because Yasui fails to teach or suggest the respective inventive combinations defined by claims 3-5, 12-14 and 17-19.

Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui in view of De Jong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,798). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 1 and while De Jong does appear to disclose the problems associated with ground bounce and power droop, De Jong does not cure the deficiencies of Yasui as outlined above. MPEP § 2143 requires that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The requirements of § 2143 are not met with Yasui and De Jong. Accordingly, at least for the same reasons mentioned above in connection with claim 1, claims 22 and 23 are allowable over the combination of Yasui and De Jong.

Claims 15, 16, 24-28, 31, 32, 35-41, 45 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui in view of Frech et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0125897). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 1 and while Frech appears to disclose the use of a switch to disconnect a power source from a circuit, Frech does not cure the deficiencies of Yasui as mentioned above in connection with claim 1. At least for those reasons, claims 15 and 16 are allowable over the combination of Yasui and Frech.

Claims 24 and 38 recite a test circuit for measuring a parameter of a circuit under test, comprising a measuring portion for measuring a parameter of said circuit under test "while said . . . test circuit is disconnected from [voltage] terminals." At least for the same reasons mentioned above in connection with claim 1, claims 24 and 38 are allowable over the combination of Yasui and Frech.

Claims 25-28, 31, 32, 35-37, 39-41, 45 and 49 depend from claims 24 and 38 and are allowable at least for the reasons mentioned above and also because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the respective inventive combinations defined by claims 25-28, 31, 32, 35-37, 39-41, 45 and 49.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: March 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No. 28,371
Salvatore P. Tamburo
Registration No. 45,153
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorneys for Applicant